

were obliged to remodel their government to correspond with the changed circumstances of the times.

That is all that is asked for or wished for here. We remodel the constitution to suit the changed circumstances of the times in Maryland, keeping in view the same fundamental principles which originally established that constitution. It is in that way that the balance of power has shifted from the Eastern Shore to the north western counties. Let it go. It is only one step in the onward march of the history of the State, and like the corresponding step in the march of the history of the United States. We all know that the balance of power has shifted from one great section of the Union to the other. Can it be stayed? No, sir. It must move on, and carry with it whatever destinies it may. The onward march of these liberal principles cannot be obstructed.

I say, therefore, that in my judgment, these accusations which have been made against us who supported the bill of the honorable gentleman from Queen Anne's, of stripping the Eastern Shore of her rights, have no foundation in justice. It is the Eastern Shore which adheres to the enjoyment of rights the foundation of which has passed away. It is upon our part an effort to prevent them from the enjoyment of exclusive privileges. That is all. I do hope that we shall in this body accustom ourselves to think and speak a little more as the representatives of the people of Maryland—as a unit. The auxiliaries of commerce are bringing all parts of the State together. We are penetrating every little creek and harbor in the State with our steamboats. This increased communication of the people with each other will infallibly, at some time or other, remove local prejudices and jealousies. It is this change in our circumstances which has caused us to do what we have done here. Our ancient prejudices are melting away, and we begin to have a little more confidence in the equity and impartiality of our fellow men. Where is the difference between a gentleman residing upon the Eastern and one residing upon the Western Shore? They have the same habits, the same interests, and the same sentiments towards the State common to them both. And when, in the course of inter-communication now going on and continually increasing, the people of the different sections of the State shall perceive that they are all citizens having common interests, a common history, common rights, and a common future, these prejudices will, in my judgment, entirely disappear.

Mr. DAVIS said that it seemed by the remarks of the honorable gentleman from Queen Anne's, (Mr. Grason,) that no principle or general rule had been adopted as the basis of representation by his scheme. He wished to inquire what had induced the gentleman to cut down Montgomery county one-half—from four delegates to two. Montgomery county had nearly 16,000 souls; Allegany had but little over 22,000. He would like to know why there was a difference of fifty per cent. between the two counties in their re-

presentation. He would like to know why there had been 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. difference between Anne Arundel and Montgomery county. He had just returned from his county, where he had been called by illness in his family, and had found his constituents exceedingly excited upon this question, and fearful that they were about to be compelled to submit to degradation in the representation to be given to them in the Legislature hereafter.

Mr. GRASON said he would endeavor to satisfy the gentleman from Montgomery. In fixing the number of delegates, whatever ratio might be established, some of the counties must lose more than others, by having a larger fraction unrepresented. But this inequality would be changed under every new apportionment. According to his plan, one delegate was allowed for every 6000 inhabitants, and one additional delegate for a fraction equal to three-fourths of that number. In allowing for fractions, his plan, like others, was arbitrary, but, after the next census, the inequality among the different counties might be reversed. He had wished to give to Charles and Montgomery counties three delegates each; but as neither had a fraction that would justify it under his rule, it was necessary to yield to the wishes of those upon whose support the success of his bill depended. Charles, Montgomery, and Queen Anne's would all lose large fractions, but it was impossible to fix any ratio or establish any rule that would produce an exact equality among all the counties of the State.

Mr. DAVIS. Then I understand that the principle or rule in settling this matter has been abandoned, and Montgomery had been sold to gain votes for the gentleman's proposition. That was the point which he wished to carry home to his constituents. He wanted them to understand that their rights had been sold to carry a favorite proposition, which politically destroys her standing and influence in the State.

Mr. GRASON said that the gentleman from Montgomery might carry back to his county what representations or misrepresentations he pleased. He had not stated that Montgomery and Charles were entitled to three delegates, but that he wished to allow that number on account of their large fractions, but that he could not gratify his own wishes in that respect without defeating the bill.

Mr. DAVIS said he would have the gentleman to understand that he did not intend to misrepresent him, nor would he be told that he would misrepresent him. He could draw no other inference from his remarks, or from the fact. They were, as the gentleman had said, that he thought Montgomery entitled to another delegate, and he wanted to give it to her, but that he could not carry his proposition by so doing. What other inference then, than that Montgomery has been sacrificed to get votes for the proposition.

Mr. STEPHENS moved the previous question, but withdrew it at the request of Mr. DORSEY, who promised to renew it.

Mr. GRASON said that it had not been his purpose to change the day of election, as it had been